

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 28 2005

NEEDLE & ROSENBERG

IMPORTANT FAX DOCUMENT

NEEDLE & ROSENBERG PC
SUITE 1000
999 PEACHTREE STREET
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30309-3915
678-420-9300
NEEDLEROSBNBERG.COM

Date: March 28, 2005

Name: Examiner Barbara Burgess - PLEASE DELIVER IMMEDIATELY

Company: USPTO

Your Reference: 09/742,091

Fax Number: (703) 872-9306

From: Gregory J. Kirsch

Our Reference No: 16178.0003U1

Our Fax Number: 678-420-9301

No. of Pages: 3 (including cover)

Comments:

Please see attached Examiner's Agenda for the interview scheduled with respect to the above-referenced patent application on Tuesday, March 29, 2005 from 11:00 to 11:30 a.m. (EST).

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The information which follows and is transmitted herewith is attorney privileged, trade secret and confidential information intended only for viewing and use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, use, communication, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address.

Meeting with Patent Examiner Barbara N Burgess

Telephonic Interview

March 29, 2005, 11:00-11:30 AM EST

U.S. Patent Application No. 09/742,091

N&R Reference: 16178.0003U1

AGENDA

DRAFT
**FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION PURPOSES
ONLY**

- I. Introduction
- II. Brief background of Proficient Systems, Inc. (patent application assignee).
- III. Discussion of the “*server-defined cells*” limitation of independent claims 1 and 14.
 - a. The Examiner rejects independent claims 1 and 14 as anticipated by Anupam (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,185).
 - b. Each independent claim of the present application incorporates a *server-defined cells* limitation.
 - c. The Applicant's representatives would like to discuss the Examiner's assertion in the Office Action dated December 1, 2004, that Anupam discloses “A main server bi-directionally connected to the computer network, the main server *grouping locations of the network sites into server-defined cells* (Figure 1, column 2, lines 25-28, 48-52, column 3, lines 26-30).”
 - d. Specifically, the representatives would like to discuss where in the cited language from Anupam the *server-defined cells* limitation of the present application is disclosed.

IV. Discussion of the “*collaborative browsing*” limitation of independent claims 1 and 14.

- a. Each independent claim of the present application incorporates a *collaborative browsing* limitation whereby two or more users see the same version of a web page being collaboratively browsed. In contrast, the browsing system in Anupam is not collaborative as in the present application but *asymmetric* where users of Anupam see a *first* and *second version* of a web page.
- b. The Applicant’s representatives would like to discuss the Examiner’s assertion in the Office Action dated December 1, 2004, that Anupam discloses “Wherein said main server enables a first one of the client programs connected to a network site in one of the server-defined cells to identify a second one of the client programs and to form a session with that second client program that *collaboratively browse* the network sites (column 3, lines 115-120, column 4, lines 1-6, column 6, lines 57-62).”
- c. Specifically, the representatives would like to discuss where in the cited language from Anupam the *collaborative browsing* limitation of the present application is disclosed.

V. Discussion of strategy for moving the patent application forward.

VI. Any other questions/comments from the Examiner.

VII. Conclusion